

Regional Water Quality Control Board

CENTRAL COAST REGION (3)



SECTION 303 (d) LIST PROPOSALS

Page left blank intentionally.

Region 3: Alamo Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Alamo Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Water Quality Objective are applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 14 bacterial samples, 8 samples exceeding (57%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods . |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Natural sources, Agriculture, Range Land. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited adequate spatial and sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Alisal Creek (Salinas)

Nitrate

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Alisal Creek (Salinas) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Nitrate/Water/Drinking Water |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Nitrate WQO is linked to MUN. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Exceedences of Basin Plan Water quality objectives in place for the protection of Municipal Drinking Water is applicable. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 7/28/99 - 2/10/00. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 6 samples with 5 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | N/A |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality.2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage.3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body.4. Water quality standard used is applicable.5. Data are numerical.6. Standard methods were used.7. Other water body age of the data were considered. <p>Most of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Alisal Creek (Salinas)

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Alisal Creek (Salinas) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Water quality objective is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 7/28/1999 to 2/10/2000 over 6 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen; 6 samples with 1 exceedence. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | N/A |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list for dissolved oxygen because applicable water quality standard is not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard for dissolved oxygen. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Alisal Creek (Salinas)

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Alisal Creek (Salinas) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Water Quality Objective are applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 6 bacteria samples, 5 samples exceeding (83%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Summer, fall, winter sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Urban Runoff, Natural Sources, Nonpoint sources, Agriculture |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | N/A |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>Most of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Arroyo Seco River

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Arroyo Seco River |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQOs are linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 2/1/99 to 4/24/2000 over 17 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 20 samples with 3 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 2 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standards. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Arroyo Seco River

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Arroyo Seco River |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO exceedences are applicable. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 2/99-4/00; 10 sampling dates (some sampling dates have multiple samples). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 18 samples, 3 exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 2 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Atascadero Creek (San Luis Obispo County)

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Atascadero Creek (San Luis Obispo County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 4/7/99 to 5/15/2000 over 18 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 21 samples with 14 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>Most of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Atascadero Creek (San Luis Obispo County)

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Atascadero Creek (San Luis Obispo County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 4/99-5/00; 16 sampling dates (some sampling dates have multiple samples). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 22 samples, 8 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 station. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Bean Creek Sedimentation-Siltation

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Bean Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Sedimentation-Siltation/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Data quality assurance procedures used. Assessment made of the consistency of methods used. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Geomorphological data is linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Sedimentation can directly affect Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data 1-3 years old, samples collected from site, one time sample event. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Riffle/Run Embeddedness = 50% samples exceed at site 14a, 60% samples exceed at site 14b, 52% samples exceed at Site B-1, 50% samples exceeded at Site B-2, 60% samples exceeded at Site B-3 and 49% samples exceeded at B-4. For Fine Sediment in Riffles 45% exceeded at Site 14a, 42% samples exceeded at Site B-2 and 55% samples exceeded at Site B-3. For D50: 37mm (minimum for a reach) 24mm for site B-1, 25mm for site B-2 and 6mm for Site B-3. Data showed impacts on fish population due to sedimentation/siltation in 1998 and 1999. |
| Spatial representation | Zig-Zag sample design, 10 samples. |
| Temporal representation | Late spring-early summer. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Standard methods were used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Improper/illegal grading of private roads and home sites, lack of vegetation around home sites, residential use, roads, quarry. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited adequate spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. |

Region 3: Bean Creek Sedimentation-Siltation

8. Other water body- information including riffle/run embeddedness and age of the data were considered.

An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate, uncertain on how interpret riffle/run embeddedness.

Region 3: Bear Creek (Santa Cruz County)

Sedimentation-Siltation

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Bear Creek (Santa Cruz County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Sedimentation-Siltation/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Data quality assurance procedures used. Assessment made of the consistency of methods used. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Geomorphological data linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Sedimentation can directly affect Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data 1-3 years old, Samples collected from site, one time sample event. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Riffle/Run Embeddedness = 40% samples exceed at Site 17a, 37.5% samples exceed at Site 17b and 45% samples exceed at Site 17c. Data showed impacts on fish population due to sedimentation/siltation in 1998 and 1999. |
| Spatial representation | Zig-Zag sample design, 10 samples. |
| Temporal representation | Late spring-early summer. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Standard methods were used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Improper/illegal grading of private roads and home sites, lack of vegetation around home sites, residential use, recreation and timber. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited adequate spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body- information including riffle/run embeddedness and age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water</p> |

Region 3: Bear Creek (Santa Cruz County)

Sedimentation-Siltation

quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate, uncertain on how interpret riffle/run embeddedness.

Region 3: Blosser Channel

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Blosser Channel |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1 |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 10 Bacteria samples, 5 samples exceeding (50%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events, excluding the dry season. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP). |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Agriculture, Pasture Lands, Urban Runoff, Storm water, Natural Sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Blosser Channel

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Blosser Channel |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 5/3/2000 to 2/28/2001 over 12 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen; 14 samples with 2 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Boulder Creek Sedimentation-Siltation

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Boulder Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Sedimentation-Siltation/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Data quality assurance procedures used. Assessment made of the consistency of methods used. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Geomorphological data linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Sedimentation can directly affect Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data 1-3 years old, Samples collected from site, one time sample event. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Riffle/Run Embeddedness = 40% samples exceed at site 17a, and 37.5% samples exceed at site 18b. Data showed impacts on fish population due to sedimentation/siltation in 1998 and 1999. |
| Spatial representation | Zig-Zag sample design, 10 samples. |
| Temporal representation | Late spring-early summer. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Standard methods were used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Improper/illegal grading of private roads and home sites, lack of vegetation around home sites, residential use, vineyards and timber. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited adequate spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body- information including riffle/run embeddedness and age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is</p> |

Region 3: Boulder Creek Sedimentation-Siltation

moderate, uncertain on how to interpret riffle/run embeddedness.

Region 3: Bradley Canyon Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Bradley Canyon Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Low oxygen levels linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Exceedences of Basin Plan water quality objective in place for the protection of aquatic life is applicable. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 1/12/2000 to 1/29/2001 over 19 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 9 samples with 2 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 3 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Bradley Canyon Creek

Fecal coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Bradley Canyon Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal coliform/water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO are applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 25 Bacteria samples, 15 samples exceeding (60% WQO violations). |
| Spatial representation | 3 Stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events, excluding the dry season. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Agriculture, Pasture Lands , Urban Runoff, Storm water, Natural Sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>Adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Bradley Canyon Creek

Nitrate

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Bradley Canyon Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Nitrate/Water/MUN |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Nitrate WQO is linked to MUN. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQOs are applicable to MUN. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 3/12/00 to 12/07/00. There were 8 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 8 samples, 4 samples exceeding. Impacts on dissolved oxygen were not observed and it is likely that the nitrate concentrations are not impacting beneficial uses. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it cannot be determined if the applicable water quality standards are exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data exhibited insufficient temporal coverage. 2. Data are numerical. 3. Standard methods were used. 4. Other water body information including age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate amount of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Bradley Channel

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Bradley Channel |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal coliform WQO is linked to Rec-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO are applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 1/00-2/01; 14 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 14 samples, 7 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sample site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Bradley Channel

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Bradley Channel |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 1/11/2000 to 2/28/2001; over 17 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 17 samples with 4 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Bradley Channel

Nitrate

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Bradley Channel |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Nitrate/Water/MUN |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Nitrate WQO is linked to MUN. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to MUN. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 1/11/00 to 2/28/01. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 15 samples with 3 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements collected. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Branciforte Creek

Sedimentation-Siltation

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Branciforte Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Sedimentation-Siltation/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Data quality assurance procedures used. Assessment made of the consistency of methods used. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Geomorphological data linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Sedimentation can directly affect Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data = 3-4 years old (1998 and 1999), samples collected from site. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Riffle/Run Embeddedness = 60% samples exceed at Site 21a and 37.5% samples exceed at Site 21b. Data showed impacts on fish population due to sedimentation/siltation in 1998 and 1999. |
| Spatial representation | Zig-Zag sample design, 10 samples. |
| Temporal representation | Late spring-early summer. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Standard methods were used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Logging in upper watershed, improper/illegal. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited adequate spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body- information including riffle/run embeddedness and age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water</p> |

Region 3: Branciforte Creek

Sedimentation-Siltation

quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate, uncertain on how to interpret riffle/run embeddedness.

Region 3: Carpinteria Creek

Virus

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Carpinteria Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Virus/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Unknown |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Virus with Bacteria WQO are linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Virus detection methodology not conclusive enough to indicate a virus problem, 30% of the samples has positive results for presence of a virus. There are too few virus data points during the most sensitive period (typically winter for pathogens). These water bodies are already covered by the existing 303(d) list. Bacteria and pathogen improvements recommended through TMDLs for these waters will also result in virus improvement. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data was not presented. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Data was not presented. |
| Spatial representation | Data was not presented. |
| Temporal representation | Data was not presented. |
| Data type | Data was not presented. |
| Use of standard method | Approved methodologies were not used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | Do not list. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be included on the 303(d) list because the water body is on an existing list for bacteria and pathogens which will address viruses.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be inadequate quality. 2. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is inadequate. 3. Non-standard methods were used. 4. Other water body information considered is unknown. <p>It is unknown whether any of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is extremely low.</p> |

Region 3: Cholame Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Cholame Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 10 bacterial samples, 8 samples exceeding (80%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events, excluding the dry season. |
| Data type | Numerical. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Pasture lands, nonpoint sources, natural sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>Most of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Cholame Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Cholame Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to COLD and WARM beneficial use protection. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data: 2-3 years old (2/2/99 to 2/8/2000); over 10 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 13 samples with 2 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Cholame Creek

Boron

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Cholame Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Boron/Water/Agricultural Water Supply |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Boron WQO is linked to Agricultural Water Supply. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Agricultural Water Supply. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 5/99-2/00; 6 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 7 samples, 7 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 station. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown; may be natural condition. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>All of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Chorro Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Chorro Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data: 3-9 years old (6/93 to 5/99). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 869 samples, 193 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 6 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Chorro Creek

Metals

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Chorro Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Metals/Sediment/Aquatic Life (Habitat Uses) |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/Q. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Metal WQOs are linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Recently collected data show that standards appear to be met. The original assessment was based on two sample locations outside of Chorro Creek. |
| Water Body-specific Information | The data originally used to support this listing decision was not collected in the water body. |
| Data used to assess water quality | New data was not presented. |
| Spatial representation | Data not collected in Chorro Creek and does not represent conditions in the creek. |
| Temporal representation | Unknown |
| Data type | N/A |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | Siltation TMDL is expected to reduce metal loads. |
| RWQCB Recommendation | Delist because data was obtain from outside the waterbody. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be removed from the section 303(d) list because data used in listing is insufficient. Data were not collected in Chorro Creek and do not represent the conditions in the creek. |

Region 3: Chumash Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Chumash Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Exceedances of Basin Plan water quality objective in place for the protection of aquatic life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 6/8/93 to 5/10/99 with over 62 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 230 samples with 35 exceedances. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the list for dissolved oxygen because the applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standards for dissolved oxygen. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Chumash Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Chumash Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) QA/QC methodology. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data: 3-9 years old (6/93-5/99). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 246 samples, 70 samples exceeding WQO . |
| Spatial representation | 1 station. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Corralitos Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Corralitos Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data: 4-5 years old (Samples taken from 12/97 to 12/98). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 13 samples, 4 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 station. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Corralitos Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Corralitos Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQOs is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data: 3-5 years old (Samples were taken from 8/18/1997 to 12/16/1998; over 15 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 16 samples with 4 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Cuyama River

Boron

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Cuyama River |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Boron/Water/Agricultural Water Supply |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Boron is linked to Basin Plan Agricultural Water Supply. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO are applicable to Agricultural Water Supply. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data: 2 year old (Samples taken from 4/00 to 12/00; 5 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 43 samples, 3 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 4 sample sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown; may be natural condition. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Dairy Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Dairy Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data: 3-9 years old (Samples taken from 6/93 to 5/99). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 635 samples, 156 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 3 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Dairy Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Dairy Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) QA/Q. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data: 3-7 years old (Samples taken from 6/8/1993 to 5/10/1999 over 291 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen; 602 samples with 110 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 3 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list for dissolved oxygen because applicable water quality standard is exceeded and it is probable that a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard for dissolved oxygen. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Elkhorn Slough

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Elkhorn Slough |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data: 2-3 years old (Samples taken from 3/1/1999 to 3/7/2000; over 14 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 15 samples with 4 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Fall Creek Sedimentation-Siltation

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Fall Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Sedimentation-Siltation/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Data quality assurance procedures used. Assessment made of the consistency of methods used. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Geomorphological data linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Sedimentation can directly affect Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data = 1-2 years old (1998 and 1999), samples collected from site. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Riffle/Run Embeddedness = 47.5% samples exceed at Site 15. For Fine Sediment in Riffles = 40% samples exceed at Site 15 (Sample size unknown in all cases). Data showed impacts on fish population due to sedimentation/siltation in 1998 and 1999. |
| Spatial representation | Zig-Zag sample design, 10 samples. |
| Temporal representation | Late spring-early summer. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Standard methods were used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Trail system in Fall State Park (stream mile 1 and above), bank erosion/slumping, Residential use, road, trails. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited adequate spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body- information including riffle/run embeddedness and age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water</p> |

Region 3: Fall Creek Sedimentation-Siltation

quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate, uncertain on how to interpret riffle/run embeddedness.

Region 3: Gabilan Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Gabilan Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 6 bacteria samples, 6 samples exceeding (100%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site |
| Temporal representation | Spring and winter sampling events during 1999 - 2000. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Urban Runoff, Natural Sources, Nonpoint sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>All of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Kings Creek Sedimentation-Siltation

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Kings Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Sedimentation-Siltation/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Data quality assurance procedures used. Assessment made of the consistency of methods used. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Geomorphological data linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Sedimentation can directly affect Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data = 2 years (1998 and 1999), samples were collected from site. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Riffle/Run Embeddedness = 52.5% sample exceed at site 19b. Data showed impacts on fish population due to sedimentation/siltation in 1998 and 1999. |
| Spatial representation | Zig-Zag sample design, 10 samples. |
| Temporal representation | Late spring-early summer. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Standard methods were used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Improper/illegal grading of private roads and home sites, lack of vegetation around home sites, residential use, roads and timber. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited adequate spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body- information including riffle/run embeddedness and age of the data were considered. |

Region 3: Kings Creek Sedimentation-Siltation

An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate, uncertain on how to interpret riffle/run embeddedness.

Region 3: La Brea Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | La Brea Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data: 1-2 years old (samples taken from 1/12/00 to 2/28/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 143 samples, 3 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: LaBrea Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | LaBrea Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data: 1-2 years old (samples taken from 1/12/2000 to 2/28/2001; over 18 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 19 samples with 3 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Llagas Creek

TDS

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Llagas Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | TDS/Water/Aquatic Life and Agriculture |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | South County Regional Wastewater Authority (SCRWA) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | TDS WQO is linked to Aquatic Life and Agriculture. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQOs are applicable to Aquatic Life and Agriculture. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-4 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 90 water samples, 90 sample exceeding (100%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 4 Stations. |
| Temporal representation | Quarterly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | South County Regional Wastewater Authority (SCRWA) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Nonpoint and point sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information including age of the data were considered. <p>All of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Llagas Creek

Sodium

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Llagas Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Sodium/Water/Agriculture, Aquatic Life and Drinking Water |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | South County Regional Wastewater Authority (SCRWA) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Sodium is linked to Agriculture, Aquatic Life and Drinking Water. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Agriculture, Aquatic Life and Drinking Water. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-10 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 78 water samples, 60 sample exceeding (77%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 4 Stations. |
| Temporal representation | Quarterly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | South County Regional Wastewater Authority (SCRWA) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Nonpoint and unknown sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information including age of the data were considered. <p>Most of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Llagas Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Llagas Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | South County Regional Wastewater Authority (SCRWA) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-4 years old. Samples taken between 12/18/97 and 1/7/99 over 30 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 90 samples with 16 exceeding the WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 7 Stations. |
| Temporal representation | Quarterly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | South County Regional Wastewater Authority (SCRWA) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Nonpoint and point source. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information including season and age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Llagas Creek

pH

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Llagas Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | pH/Water/Aquatic Life and MUN |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | South County Regional Wastewater Authority (SCRWA) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | pH WQO is linked to Aquatic Life and MUN. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life and MUN. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-4 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 128 samples, 42 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 4 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Quarterly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | South County Regional Wastewater Authority (SCRWA) methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Llagas Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Llagas Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 3-4 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 41 bacteria samples, 26 samples exceeding (63%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 3 Stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Pasture lands, nonpoint sources, natural sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Llagas Creek Chloride

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Llagas Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Chloride/Water/Agriculture and Drinking Water |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | South County Regional Wastewater Authority (SCRWA) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Chloride WQO is linked to Agriculture and Drinking Water. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Site-specific WQO applicable to Agriculture and Drinking Water. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-10 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 78 water samples, 78 samples exceeding (100%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 4 Stations. |
| Temporal representation | Quarterly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | South County Regional Wastewater Authority (SCRWA) methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Nonpoint and point sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information including age of the data were considered. <p>All of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Los Osos Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Los Osos Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 3-6 years old (samples taken from 3/96 to 5/99). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 242 samples, 63 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 2 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Los Osos Creek

Priority organics

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Los Osos Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Priority organics/Water--Sediment/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Priority Organic WQO is linked to Aquatic life |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data 1 year old. Samples were collect in the Spring and Summer of 2001. Two sampling events at mostly 5 sites for both water and sediment. A total number of samples collected during the 2 sampling events there were; 9 water samples and 8 sediment. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 9 water sample/0 samples exceeding and 8 sediment samples/0 samples exceeding. The results indicate chemical in concentrations below NOAA and ERMs. |
| Spatial representation | Five sites. |
| Temporal representation | Two sampling events in 2001. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | Delist because new data points towards no impairment. Most current data indicates WQO per CTR and BP are met. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded in sediment or water.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information including the effects of season and age of the data were considered. <p>None of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Los Osos Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Los Osos Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to aquatic life protection. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 3-7 years old. Samples taken from 1/26/94 to 5/10/99 with over 147 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 251 water samples, 44 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 2 Stations. |
| Temporal representation | Sampled monthly during all seasons. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Agriculture, Urban Runoff, Pasture Lands, Unknown Sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body information including age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Love Creek Sedimentation-Siltation

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Love Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Sedimentation-Siltation/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Data quality assurance procedures used. Assessment made of the consistency of methods used. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Geomorphological data linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Sedimentation can directly affect Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data = 2 years old (samples taken in 1998 and 1999), Samples collected from site. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Riffle/Run Embeddedness = 44% samples exceed at Site L-1. For D50: 37 = 30mm sample at Site Z-8. Data showed impacts on fish population due to sedimentation/siltation in 1998 and 1999. |
| Spatial representation | Zig-Zag sample design, 10 samples. |
| Temporal representation | Late spring-early summer. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Standard methods were used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Improper/illegal grading of private roads and home sites, lack of vegetation around home sites, agriculture, residential use, roads and timber. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited adequate spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body- information including riffle/run embeddedness and age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water</p> |

Region 3: Love Creek Sedimentation-Siltation

quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate, uncertain on how to interpret riffle/run embeddedness.

Region 3: Main Street Canal

Nitrate

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Main Street Canal |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Nitrate/Water/Drinking Water |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Nitrate WQO is linked to Drinking Water. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Drinking Water. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 10 water samples, 6 samples exceeding (60%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Agriculture, Nonpoint Sources and Urban Runoff. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information including age of the data were considered. <p>Most of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Majors Creek

Turbidity

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Majors Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Turbidity/Water/MUN and Aquatic life (WARM, COLD, SPWN) |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | City of Santa Cruz data, QAPP unknown. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Heavy sedimentation affects drinking water quality and habitat functions. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Narrative objective: Waters shall be free of changes in turbidity that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses. |
| Water Body-specific Information | The City stated this watershed is experiencing increasingly frequent periods of high turbidity associated with the heavy sedimentation attributed to natural background erosion sources, the large network of unmaintained seasonal rads, log jam related stream bank erosions, feral pig activity and other factors. In addition to drinking water quality and production challenges posed by these conditions, the channel itself (especially the East Branch) is choked with sediment, thereby limiting habitat functions. |
| Data used to assess water quality | <p>The City describes high turbidity associated with heavy sedimentation due to erosion, seasonal roads, log jam-related erosion, feral pigs, and other factors.</p> <p>Photographs and some turbidity data were submitted. The units of measure of the data do not match the units required by the water quality objective. The data cannot be compared to the water quality objective.</p> <p>It is difficult to interpret the photographs submitted for sediment impairment. In addition, it is difficult to compared the turbidity information to measure impact, because turbidity measured used in samples (NTU) differ from the Basin Plan's turbidity units (JTU). There is not a conversion from NTUs to JTUs.</p> |
| Spatial representation | Unknown. |
| Temporal representation | Unknown. |
| Data type | Both numerical and non-numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Unknown. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Natural sources, erosion, unmaintained roads, log jams, stream bank erosion, feral pig activity |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded. |

Region 3: Majors Creek

Turbidity

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data is considered to be of unknown quality. Turbidity measurements do not correspond to turbidity units used in the basin plan. Photographs submitted are difficult to quantify.
2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage.

An inadequate amount of the water quality data and information exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is extremely low.

Region 3: Monterey Bay at Aquarium

Dissolved Oxygen, temperature, total coliform, fecal coliform, enteroc +

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Monterey Bay at Aquarium |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen, temperature, total coliform, fecal coliform, enterococcus, total ammonia, nitrite, nitrate, phosphate, pH/Water/All Ocean-Bay Uses |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Monterey Bay Aquarium QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Measurements related to all Ocean Beneficial Uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan Objectives are applicable Ocean uses. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age =1 - 5 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Number of samples unknown, question about quality of D.O. measurements after passing through pump and sump house. |
| Spatial representation | Only represents one point at 50 foot depth in all of Monterey Bay. |
| Temporal representation | D.O. data only covered one year; Only one summer (June-Aug 2000) of poor D.O. results; Other stressors sampled for five years |
| Data type | Numerical Data; Dissolved Oxygen data judged to be insufficient for this listing cycle due to questions of temporal, spatial, and Dissolved Oxygen data quality |
| Use of standard method | Unknown. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the list based on the inadequate spatial and temporal coverage.</p> <p>The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is extremely low.</p> |

Region 3: Moro Cojo Slough

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Moro Cojo Slough |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old (samples taken from 4/1999 to 2/2000). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 7 samples, 1 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 station. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is low.</p> |

Region 3: Moro Cojo Slough

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Moro Cojo Slough |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old (samples taken from 3/1/1999 to 3/7/2000 over 13 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen; 14 samples with 9 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Moss Landing Harbor

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Moss Landing Harbor |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old (samples taken from 3/1/1999 to 3/7/2000 over 14 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 15 samples with 0 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>None of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that the standard was not exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Mountain Charlie Gulch

Sedimentation-Siltation

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Mountain Charlie Gulch |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Sedimentation-Siltation/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Data quality assurance procedures used. Assessment made of the consistency of methods used. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Geomorphological data linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Sedimentation can directly affect aquatic life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2 years old (1998 and 1999), Samples collected from site. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Riffle/Run embeddedness = 40% samples exceed at Site 16b, 35% samples exceed at Site 16c. For Fine Sediments in Riffles = 38% samples exceed at Site Z-3. For D50: 37mm (minimum for a reach) = 11mm at Site Z-3. Data showed impacts on fish population due to sedimentation/siltation in 1998 and 1999. |
| Spatial representation | Zig-Zag sample design, 10 samples. |
| Temporal representation | Late spring-early summer. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Standard methods were used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Residential use, timber, roads. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited adequate spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body- information including riffle/run embeddedness and age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water</p> |

Region 3: Mountain Charlie Gulch

Sedimentation-Siltation

quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate, uncertain on how to interpret riffle/run embeddedness.

Region 3: Newell Creek (Upper)

Sedimentation-Siltation

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Newell Creek (Upper) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Sedimentation-Siltation/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Data quality assurance procedures used. Assessment made of the consistency of methods used. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Geomorphological data linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Sedimentation can directly affect aquatic life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data = 2 years old (1998 and 1999), Samples collected from site. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Riffle/Run embeddedness = 40% samples exceed at Site 16b, 35% samples exceed at Site 16c. Data showed impacts on fish population due to sedimentation/siltation in 1998 and 1999. |
| Spatial representation | Zig-Zag sample design, 10 samples. |
| Temporal representation | Late spring-early summer. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Standard methods were used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Improper/illegal grading of private roads and home sites, lack of vegetation around home sites, agriculture, residential use, roads and timber. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited adequate spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body- information including riffle/run embeddedness and age of the data were considered. |

Region 3: Newell Creek (Upper)

Sedimentation-Siltation

An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate, uncertain on how to interpret riffle/run embeddedness.

Region 3: Nipomo Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Nipomo Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Exceedances of Basin Plan water quality objective in place for the protection of aquatic life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 6/29/00 to 3/1/01 with over 18 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 31 samples with 4 exceedances. |
| Spatial representation | 2 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the list for dissolved oxygen because the applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standards for dissolved oxygen. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Nipomo Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Nipomo Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO are applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 25 bacteria samples, 18 exceeding samples (72%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 2 sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Urban Runoff, Agriculture, Natural Sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>Adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Old Salinas River Estuary

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Old Salinas River Estuary |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old (samples taken from 3/1/1999 to 3/7/2000 over 14 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 28 samples with 11 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 2 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that the standard was exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Old Salinas River Estuary

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Old Salinas River Estuary |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old (samples taken from 4/99 to 2/00). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 19 samples, 6 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 2 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Orcutt Solomon Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Orcutt Solomon Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/Q. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 year old (samples taken from 1/12/2000 to 2/28/2001 over 18 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 42 samples with 2 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 4 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that the standard was not exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Orcutt Solomon Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Orcutt Solomon Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 50 bacteria samples, 31 samples exceeding (62%) WQO |
| Spatial representation | 3 sites |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events |
| Data type | Numerical. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Pasture lands, nonpoint sources, natural sources and Agriculture. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Orcutt Solomon Creek

Boron

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Orcutt Solomon Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Boron/Water/Agricultural Water Supply |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Boron WQO is linked to Agricultural Water Supply. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO are applicable to Agriculture Water Supply. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2 years old (samples taken from 4/2000 to 12/2000). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 34 samples, 5 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 3 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown; may be natural condition. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Orcutt Solomon Creek

Nitrate

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Orcutt Solomon Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Nitrate/Water/Drinking Water |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Nitrate WQO is linked to MUN. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to MUN. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old (samples taken from 1/12/00 to 2/28/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 45 samples, 31 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 3 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Oso Flaco Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Oso Flaco Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old (samples taken from 1/2000 to 1/2001; 13 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 14 samples, 6 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Oso Flaco Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Oso Flaco Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old (samples taken from 1/12/2000 to 3/1/2001 over 19 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 15 samples, 0 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 4 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>None of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Oso Flaco Creek

Nitrate

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Oso Flaco Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Nitrate/Water/MUN |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Nitrate WQO is linked to MUN. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to MUN. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old (samples taken from 1/12/00 to 1/31/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 15 samples with 15 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 2 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>All of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Oso Flaco Lake

Nitrate

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Oso Flaco Lake |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Nitrate/Water/MUN |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Nitrate WQO is linked to MUN. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQOs are applicable to MUN. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 55 water samples, 55 samples exceeding (100%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 3 Stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Agriculture and nonpoint sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information including age of the data were considered. <p>All of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Oso Flaco Lake

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Oso Flaco Lake |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2 years old (samples taken from 9/7/2000 to 9/8/2000 over 2 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen; 12 samples, 0 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 6 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list for dissolved oxygen because applicable water quality standard is not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard for dissolved oxygen. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Pacheco Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Pacheco Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old (samples taken from 12/1997 to 12/1998). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 13 samples, 3 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 station. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacheco Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Pacheco Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 4-5 years old (samples taken from 12/18/1997 to 12/16/1998 over 15 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 16 samples, 3 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean (various sites)

Total coliform, e. coli, enterococcus, nitrate, phosphate, sulfate, tu +

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean (various sites) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Total coliform, E. coli, Enterococcus, nitrate, phosphate, sulfate, turbidity, Dissolved Oxygen, temperature, conductivity, pH/water/all ocean-bay uses |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara Channel Keeper, QA/QC is unknown |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Measurements are linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Unknown. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Unknown. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Data indicates suddenly elevated bacteria concentrations but standards are not exceeded. Data supplemented with data from Santa Barbara County Public Health Dept., leading to three beaches to be listed. |
| Spatial representation | Unknown. |
| Temporal representation | Unknown. |
| Data type | Unknown. |
| Use of standard method | Standard methods were not used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of inadequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage is unknown. <p>Uncertain whether water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is extremely low.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Arroyo Burro (Santa Barbara County)

Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Arroyo Burro (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform Ocean standards are linked to the REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 8/5/96-4/25/01. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 3/3-4/14/97; 1/12-3/2/98; 3/1-4/26/99. Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 5/5-6/2/97; 12/29/97-1/27/98; 2/2-3/2/98; 3/2-30/98; 5/4-6/1/98; 7/6-29/98; 8/3-8/31/98; 1/25-1/27/99; 4/5-5/3/99; 5/10-6/1/99; 1/31-2/28/00. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standard for total coliform are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard for total coliform. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Arroyo Burro Beach (Santa Barbara County)

Virus

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Arroyo Burro Beach (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Virus/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Unknown |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Virus indicators-Bacteria WQOs are linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | These water bodies are already covered by the existing 303(d) list. Bacteria and pathogen improvements recommended through TMDLs for these waters will also result in virus improvement. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data was not presented. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Data was not presented. |
| Spatial representation | Data was not presented. |
| Temporal representation | Unknown |
| Data type | Data was not presented. |
| Use of standard method | An approved methodology was not used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Data was not presented. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | Do not list. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be included on the 303(d) list because the water body is on an existing list for bacteria and pathogens which will address viruses.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be inadequate quality. 2. Data types are unknown. 3. Other water body information considered is unknown. <p>It is unknown whether any of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is extremely low.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Arroyo Quemado Beach (Santa Barbara County + Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Arroyo Quemado Beach (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Public Health Dept. (SBCPHD) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 250 bacteria samples, 143 samples exceeding (57%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Public Health Dept. (SBCPHD) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Pasture Lands, Agriculture, Nonpoint and natural sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Arroyo Quemado Beach (Santa Barbara County + Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Arroyo Quemado Beach (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Total Coliform/Water/Ocean Plan Shellfish Harvest and REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Public Health Dept. (SBCPHD) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Total coliform Ocean Plan standards are linked to Shellfish Harvest and REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan WQO are applicable to Ocean Plan Shellfish Harvest and REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 250 bacteria samples, 213 samples exceeding (85%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Public Health Dept. (SBCPHD) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Pasture Lands, Agriculture, Nonpoint and natural sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Butterfly Beach (Santa Barbara County)

Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Butterfly Beach (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Used Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. Data, QA/QC . |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Total Coliform Ocean Plan standards are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old (1/3/00-4/23/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for: None. Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 2/7-3/1/00; 2/5-3/6/01. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Used Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. Data methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>A relatively small number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Capitola Beach (Santa Cruz County)

Fecal and Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Capitola Beach (Santa Cruz County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal and Total Coliform/Water/ REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC . |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform Ocean Plan Standards are linked to REC- 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan Standards are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-3 years old (4/29/99 - 5/30/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Capitola Beach (0240): Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% of samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for: 2/14-4/15/00. Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for: 4/15-5/9/00; 1/8-2/5/01; 2/5-3/6/01. |
| Spatial representation | 14 sites. |
| Temporal representation | For Capitola Beach; weekly sampling (with a few weeks missing). For remaining sites: Highly variable. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Dept. methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>A relatively small number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Carpinteria City Beach (Santa Barbara Coun + Fecal and Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Carpinteria City Beach (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal and Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform Ocean Plan standards are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC 1.. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-4 years old (6/22/98-4/23/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 1/2/01-2-26-01. Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 1/3-1/31/00; 2/7-3/6/00; 1/2/01-1/29/01; 2/20-3/12/01. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. Methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>A relatively small number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Carpinteria State Beach- Carpinteria Creek + Fecal and Total Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Carpinteria State Beach- Carpinteria Creek Mouth (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal and Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. data, QA/QC methodology. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1 - 5 years old (3/10/97-4/23/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 12/1/97-1/27/98; 7/6-8/31/98; 9/8-11/2/98; 1/4/99-2/22/99; 1/16-2/26/01. Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 12/1-12/29/97; 1/5-27/98; 2/9-3/9/98; 3/30-4/27/98; 5/26-6/22/98; 7/6-7/27/98; 8/3-31/98; 9/8-28/98; 11/2-11/30/98; 1/4-25/99; 3/15-4/14/99; 5/3-6/1/99; 2/17-3/6/00; 1/2-21/01; 2/5-3/6/01. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Carpinteria State Beach- Carpinteria Creek + Fecal and Total Coliform

Many the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard.
The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at City College Beach (Leadbetter Beach)

Virus

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at City College Beach (Leadbetter Beach) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Virus/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | No QAPP |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Virus with Bacteria WQOs are linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | These water bodies are already covered by the existing 303(d) list. Bacteria and pathogen improvements recommended through TMDLs for these waters will also result in virus improvement. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data was not presented. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Data was not presented. |
| Spatial representation | Data was not presented. |
| Temporal representation | Data was not presented. |
| Data type | Data was not presented. |
| Use of standard method | An approved method was not used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | Do not list. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be included on the 303(d) list because the water body is on an existing list for bacteria and pathogens.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is inadequate. 2. Non-standard methods were used. 3. Other water body information considered is unknown. <p>It is unknown whether any of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is extremely low.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Cowell Beach (Santa Cruz County)

Fecal coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Cowell Beach (Santa Cruz County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Dept. data, QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform WQOs are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-4 years old (10/2/98 - 5/30/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | <p>Cowell @ Stairs (0494): Fecal Coliform Objective (Geometric mean exceed 200 per 100 ml in 30 days) exceeded for: 8/3-8/30/99; 9/7-10/5/99; Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% of samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for: 4/14-6/13/00. Cowell Beach (0490): Fecal Coliform Objective (Geometric mean exceed 200 per 100 ml in 30 days) exceeded for: 8/30-9/27/99. Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% of samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for: 4/17-6/13/00.</p> <p>For Cowell @ Stairs and Cowell Beach; weekly sampling (with a few weeks missing). For remaining sites: highly variable.</p> |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Cruz County Health Department. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Cowell Beach (Santa Cruz County)

Fecal coliform

A relatively small number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at East Beach (mouth of Mission Creek, Santa + Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at East Beach (mouth of Mission Creek, Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Total Coliform/Water/Ocean Plan Shellfish Harvest, REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Public Health Dept. (SBCPHD) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Total Coliform linked to Shellfish Harvest and REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Assembly Bill 411 Beach Posting is applicable to Shellfish Harvest and REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1- 6 years. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 262 bacteria samples, 181 samples exceeding (69%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Public Health Dept. (SBCPHD) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Urban Runoff, Non point sources, Unknown sources, Agriculture. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at East Beach (mouth of Mission Creek, Santa + Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at East Beach (mouth of Mission Creek, Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/Ocean Plan REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Public Health Dept. (SBCPHD) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform Ocean Plan standard is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Assembly Bill Beach 411 Posting is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-6 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 262 bacteria samples, 160 samples exceeding (61%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Public Health Dept. (SBCPHD) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Urban Runoff, Agriculture, Natural Source, Non point sources and unknown sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at East Beach (mouth of Mission Creek, Santa + Virus

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at East Beach (mouth of Mission Creek, Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Virus/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | QAPP was not used. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Virus correlated to bacteria indicators are linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | These water bodies are already covered by the existing 303(d) list. Bacteria and pathogen improvements recommended through TMDLs for these waters will also result in virus improvement. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Unknown. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Unknown. |
| Spatial representation | Unknown. |
| Temporal representation | Unknown. |
| Data type | Unknown. |
| Use of standard method | An approved methodology was not used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | Do not list. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be included on the 303(d) list because the water body is on an existing list for bacteria and pathogens.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of inadequate quality. 2. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is inadequate. 3. Non-standard methods were used. 4. Other water body information considered is unknown. <p>It is unknown whether any of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is extremely low.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at East Beach (mouth of Sycamore Creek, Santa + Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at East Beach (mouth of Sycamore Creek, Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform Ocean Plan standards are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old (4/7/97 - 4/23/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | <p>Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 1/5-3/2/98; 5/4-6/29/98; 3/1-4/26/99.</p> <p>Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 12/1-29/97; 1/5-27/98; 2/2-3/2/98; 3/9-4/6/98; 4/13-5/11/98; 6/1-29/98; 8/3-31/98; 10/12-11/9/98; 3/15-4/12/99; 2/2-3/1/00; 2/5-26/01; 3/6-26/01.</p> |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standard for total coliform are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of water quality measurements exceeded the water</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at East Beach (mouth of Sycamore Creek, Santa + Total Coliform

quality standard for total coliform. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at El Capitan Beach (Santa Barbara County)

Fecal and Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at El Capitan Beach (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal and Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Used Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform Ocean Plan standards are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-6 years old (9/4/96 - 4/23/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | <p>Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: none.</p> <p>Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 12/1-29/97; 2/2-3/2/98; 8/17-9/14/98; 1/24-2/22/00; 1/29-2/26/01; 3/6-26/01.</p> |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Used Santa Barbara County Environmental Health methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>A relatively small number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Gaviota Beach (Mouth of Canada de la Gavio + Total Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Gaviota Beach (Mouth of Canada de la Gaviota Creek) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform Ocean Plan standards is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old (3/10/97 - 4/23/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | <p>Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 5/5-6/30/97; 3/8-5/3/99; 1/31-3/27/00; 7/31-9/28/00.</p> <p>Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 4/21-5/19/97; 6/2-30/97; 11/3-12/1/97; 1/5-2/2/98; 6/15/98-9/21/98; 10/12/98- 12/7/98; 1/4-27/99; 3/15-4/14/99; 6/22-7/19/99; 8/16-9/13/99; 1/31-3/1/00; 3/6/00 [>10000]; 5/22/00-8/16/00; 9/5- 10/30/00; 11/27-12/26/00; 1/2/01-4/11/01.</p> |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standard for total coliform are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Gaviota Beach (Mouth of Canada de la Gavio + Total Coliform

An adequate number of water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard for total coliform. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Goleta Beach (Santa Barbara County)

Fecal and Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Goleta Beach (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal and Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Used Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC . |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old (1/27/97 - 4/23/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | <p>Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 9/8-11/2/98; 2/5-4/2/01.</p> <p>Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 2/2-3/2/98; 3/15-4/14/99; 2/7-3/8/00; 1/4-29/01; 2/5-28/01; 3/6-8/01.</p> |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>A relatively small number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Guadalupe Dunes (Santa Barbara County)

Total coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Guadalupe Dunes (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal and Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform Ocean Plan standards are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old (1/27/97- 4/23/0). |
| Data used to assess water quality | <p>Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: none.</p> <p>Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 6/9-7/7/97; 6/29-7/27/98; 8/2-30/99; 7/5-31/00; 9/5-10/2/00; 2/12-3/12/01.</p> |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>A relatively small number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Hammonds Beach (Santa Barbara County)

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Hammonds Beach (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform Ocean Plan standards are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old (1/6/97 - 4/23/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | <p>Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 1/27-3/23/98; 2/22-4/19/00.</p> <p>Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 1/6-2/3/97; 3/3-31/97; 12/1-29/97; 2/2-3/2/98; 3/9-4/6/98; 10/12-11/9/98; 1/31-2/28/00; 2/5-3/6/01.</p> |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standard for fecal coliform are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard for fecal coliform. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Hope Ranch Beach (Santa Barbara County)

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Hope Ranch Beach (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform Ocean Plan standards are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old (1/6/97- 4/23/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | <p>Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 2/2-3/30/98; 1/18-3/13/00.</p> <p>Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 2/3-3/3/97; 12/1-29/97; 2/2-3/2/98; 11/30-12/28/98; 3/15-4/14/99; 10/11-11/8/99; 1/3-31/00; 1/31-2/28/00; 3/6/00; 4/17/00 [>10,000]; 10/30-11/27/00; 1/2-29/01; 2/5-26/01.</p> |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standard for fecal coliform are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Hope Ranch Beach (Santa Barbara County)

Fecal Coliform

An adequate number of water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard for fecal coliform. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Jalama Beach (Santa Barbara County)

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Jalama Beach (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/Ocean Plan Shellfish Harvest and REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Public Health Dept. (SBCPHD) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform Ocean Plan standard is linked to Shellfish Harvest and REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Assembly Bill Beach 411 Posting is applicable to Shellfish Harvest and REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 222 bacteria samples, 111 samples exceeding (50%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Public Health Dept. (SBCPHD) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Pasture Lands, Agriculture, Nonpoint and natural sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Jalama Beach (Santa Barbara County)

Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Jalama Beach (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Total Coliform/Water/Ocean Plan Shellfish Harvest and REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Public Health Dept. (SBCPHD) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Total Coliform Ocean Plan WQO is linked to Shellfish Harvest and REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan WQO is applicable to Shellfish Harvest and REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 222 bacteria samples, 118 samples exceeding (53%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Public Health Dept. (SBCPHD) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Pasture Lands, Agriculture, Nonpoint and natural sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Leadbetter Beach (Santa Barbara County)

Fecal and Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Leadbetter Beach (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal and Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC . |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform Ocean Plan standards are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old (1/6/97 - 4/23/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | <p>Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 12/2/96- 1/27/97; 11/3-12/29/97; 2/2-3/30/98.</p> <p>Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 1/6-1/27/97; 11/3-12/1/97; 2/2-3/2/98; 11/1-29/99; 2/7-3/8/00; 2/12-3/12/01.</p> |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling (with the exception of a few weeks). |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. methodology. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>A relatively small number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at New Brighton Beach (Santa Cruz County)

Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at New Brighton Beach (Santa Cruz County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform Ocean Plan standards are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-3 years old (5/26/99 - 10/31/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% of samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for: None. Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for: 10/2-10/31/00. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling (with a few weeks missing). |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Dept. methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>A relatively small number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Ocean Beach (Santa Barbara County)

Total and Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Ocean Beach (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Total and Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Total and Fecal Coliform Ocean Plan standard is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old (4/7/97- 4/16/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | <p>Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 10/12-12/7/98; 3/15-5/10/99.</p> <p>Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 1/5-2/2/98; 1/27-2/23/98; 5/4-6/1/98; 6/15-8/17/98; 10/5-11/30/98; 1/4-2/1/99; 3/8-6/28/99; 8/2-30/99; 9/7-10/4/99; 2/28/00 [>10000].</p> |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standard are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Ocean Beach (Santa Barbara County)

Total and Fecal Coliform

An adequate number of water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard for total coliform. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Pajaro Dunes Beach (Santa Cruz County)

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Pajaro Dunes Beach (Santa Cruz County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC methodology. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-3 years old (5/5/99 - 5/30/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% of samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for: 2/23-4/26/00. Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for: Insufficient data. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling (with a few weeks missing). |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Dept. methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>A relatively small number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Point Rincon (Mouth of Rincon Creek, Santa + Fecal and Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Point Rincon (Mouth of Rincon Creek, Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal and Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC methodology. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform Ocean Plan standards are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old (5/5/97- 4/23/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | <p>Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 6/23-8/18/97; 11/3-12/29/97; 5/18-8/17/98; 1/19-3/15/99; 3/6-5/1/00.</p> <p>Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 5/13/97- 8/11/97; 10/27- 11/17/97; 12/1-29/97; 1/5/98- 10/26/98 (all); 1/4-2/1/99; 3/15-4/12/99; 7/19-8/16/99; 10/18-11/15/99; 1/31-2/28/00; 3/6/00 [>10000]; 10/2-30/00; 2/12-3/8/01.</p> |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | Unknown. |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Point Rincon (Mouth of Rincon Creek, Santa + Fecal and Total Coliform

An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Refugio Beach (Santa Barbara County)

Total Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Refugio Beach (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC methodology. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old (3/10/97- 4/23/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | <p>Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 10/4-11/29/99; 2/5-3/26/01.</p> <p>Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 6/2-30/97; 12/1-29/97; 1/5/98-5/4/98; 6/1-29/98; 8/3/98-11/30/98; 3/1-29/99; 4/5-5/3/99; 6/28-8/30/99; 10/25-11/22/99; 1/31-3/1/00; 3/6/00 [>10000]; 6/5-7/5/00; 2/5- 3/26/01.</p> |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standard for total coliform are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Refugio Beach (Santa Barbara County)

Total Coliform

An adequate number of water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard for total coliform. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Rio Del Mar (Santa Cruz County)

Fecal and Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Rio Del Mar (Santa Cruz County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal and Total Coliform/Water/Ocean Plan Water Contact Standards and REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC methodology. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform Ocean Plan standards are linked to REC-1 . |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable the REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1- 4 years old (1/5/98 - 5/30/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Rio Del Mar Beach @ Aptos Creek Mouth: Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% of samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for: 9/7-11/18/99; 11/18/99-1/10/00. Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for: 12/11/00-1/8/01; 1/29/01-2/26/01. |
| Spatial representation | 7 sites. |
| Temporal representation | For Rio Del Mar Beach @ Aptos Creek Mouth; weekly sampling (with a few weeks missing). For remaining sites: Highly variable. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Dept. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>A relatively small number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Sands Beach - Coal Oil Point (Santa Barbar + Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Sands Beach - Coal Oil Point (Santa Barbara County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. data, QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform Ocean Plan standards are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-8 years old (10/21/96- 4/25/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | <p>Fecal Coliform Objective (>10% samples in 60 days exceed 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: none.</p> <p>Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for at least: 11/18-12/16/96; 12/29/97-1/27/98; 2/2-3/2/98; 2/7-3/6/00; 2/5-3/6/01.</p> |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Dept. methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>A relatively small number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pacific Ocean at Twin Lakes Beach (Santa Cruz County)

Fecal and Total Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pacific Ocean at Twin Lakes Beach (Santa Cruz County) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal and Total Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Dept. QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal and Total Coliform Ocean Plan standards are linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Ocean Plan standards are applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-3 years old (4/26/99 - 5/30/01). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Fecal Coliform Objective (Geometric mean exceed 200 per 100 ml in 30 days) exceeded for 1/20-2/27/00 (>10% of samples in 60 days exceeded 400 per 100 ml) exceeded for: 9/7-11/18/99; 11/18/99-1/10/00. Total Coliform Objective (>20% of samples in 30 days exceed 1,000 per 100 ml) exceeded for: 1/29-2/26/01. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Weekly sampling (with a few weeks missing). |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Dept. methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>A relatively small number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Pajaro River

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Pajaro River |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/Basin Plan WQO |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 3-5 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 11 bacteria samples, 10 samples exceeding (90%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Pasture lands, Agriculture, and natural sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Pennington Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Pennington Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 3-8 years old (samples taken from 6/1993 to 5/1999). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 237 samples, 68 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 station. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Quail Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Quail Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 6 bacteria samples, 4 samples exceeding (63%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Spring and winter sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Pasture lands, Agriculture, and natural sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Quail Creek

Nitrate

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Quail Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Nitrate/Water/MUN |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Nitrate WQO is linked to MUN. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Municipal Drinking Water. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 3 years old (samples taken from 2/1/99 to 11/30/99). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 6 samples, 4 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been established and apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements collected to determine whether the water quality standard was exceeded. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Quail Creek

Boron

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Quail Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Boron/Water/Agricultural Water Supply |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Boron WQO is linked to Agricultural Water Supply. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Agricultural Water Supply. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 3 years old (samples taken from 7/1999 to 11/1999). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 7 samples, 1 sample exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 station. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown; may be natural condition. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Quail Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Quail Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old (samples taken from 2/1/1999 to 2/10/2000; over 8 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 11 samples, 1 sample exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 2 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Salinas Reclamation Canal

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Salinas Reclamation Canal |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO are applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 37 bacteria samples, 33 samples exceeding (89%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 3 Stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Urban runoff, Pasture Lands, Natural Sources and Agriculture. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Salinas Reclamation Canal

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Salinas Reclamation Canal |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old (samples taken from 2/1/1999 to 2/10/2000; over 27 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 39 samples, 17 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 3 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Salinas Reclamation Canal

Nitrate

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Salinas Reclamation Canal |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Nitrate/Water/Drinking Water |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Nitrate WQO is linked to MUN. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to MUN. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old (samples taken from 2/1/1999 to 2/10/2000). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 34 samples with 13 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 2 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Salinas River (lower, estuary to near Gonzales Rd crossing, + Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Salinas River (lower, estuary to near Gonzales Rd crossing, watersheds 309.10 and 309.20) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old (samples taken from 2/1/1999 to 5/15/2000; over 29 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 64 samples with 3 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 4 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Salinas River (lower, estuary to near Gonzales Rd crossing, + Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Salinas River (lower, estuary to near Gonzales Rd crossing, watersheds 309.10 and 309.20) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old [samples taken from 2/99 to 2/00; 13 sampling dates (some sampling dates have multiple samples)]. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 54 samples, 14 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 4 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Salinas River (lower, estuary to near Gonzales Rd crossing, + Boron

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Salinas River (lower, estuary to near Gonzales Rd crossing, watersheds 309.10 and 309.20) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Boron/Water/Agricultural Water Supply |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Boron WQO is linked to Agricultural Water Supply. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Agricultural Water Supply. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old [samples taken from 7/1999 to 5/2000; 12 sampling dates (some sampling dates have multiple samples)]. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 13 samples, 4 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 4 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown; may be natural condition. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Salinas River (middle, near Gonzales Rd crossing to confluence + Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Salinas River (middle, near Gonzales Rd crossing to confluence with Nacimiento River) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old (samples taken from 2/2/1999 to 4/24/2000; over 27 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 51 samples with 5 exceedences. |
| Spatial representation | 3 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | Unknown. |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Salinas River (middle, near Gonzales Rd crossing to confluence + Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Salinas River (middle, near Gonzales Rd crossing to confluence with Nacimiento River) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old (samples taken from 2/1999 to 4/2000; 15 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 15 samples, 2 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 station. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Salinas River (upper, confluence of Nacimiento River to San + Chloride

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Salinas River (upper, confluence of Nacimiento River to Santa Margarita Reservoir) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Chloride/Water/MUN and Agriculture |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Chloride WQO is linked to Agriculture and MUN. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to MUN and Agriculture. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 42 water samples, 42 samples exceeding (100%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 3 Stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Agriculture, Urban Runoff, Pasture Lands. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information including age of the data were considered. <p>All of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Salinas River (upper, confluence of Nacimiento River to San + Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Salinas River (upper, confluence of Nacimiento River to Santa Margarita Reservoir) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen is linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 3-5 years old (samples taken from 2/2/1999 to 5/15/2000; over 16 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 29 samples with 4 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 3 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list for dissolved oxygen because applicable water quality standard is not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard for dissolved oxygen. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Salinas River (upper, confluence of Nacimiento River to San + Sodium

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Salinas River (upper, confluence of Nacimiento River to Santa Margarita Reservoir) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Sodium/water/Agriculture and MUN |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Sodium is linked to Agriculture and MUN. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Agriculture and MUN. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old |
| Data used to assess water quality | 32 water samples, 32 samples exceeding (100%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 3 Stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Agriculture, Urban Runoff, Pasture Lands. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate, quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information including age of the data were considered. <p>All of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Salinas River (upper, confluence to Nacimiento River to Mar + Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Salinas River (upper, confluence to Nacimiento River to Margarita Reservoir) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 3-5 years old (samples taken from 2/1999 to 2/2000; 7 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 7 samples, 1 sample exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 4 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it cannot be determined if applicable water quality standards are exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage.</p> |

Region 3: Salinas River near Chualar

Sulfate

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Salinas River near Chualar |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Sulfate/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | USGS QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Sulfate WQO is linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-5 years old (1997-2001). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 16 samples, 3 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | One segment of river near Chualar, CA (Represents only one location on Salinas River.). |
| Temporal representation | 16 samples collected over 5 years. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | USGS methods were used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown; may be natural condition. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: San Antonio Creek (San Antonio Watershed)

Boron

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | San Antonio Creek (San Antonio Watershed) |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Boron/Water/Agricultural Water Supply |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | USGS QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Boron WQO is linked to Agricultural Water Supply. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable Agricultural Water Supply. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-4 years old (1998-2001). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 6 samples, 4 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | One station. |
| Temporal representation | Winter, Spring, and Summer for 1998-2001 (6 sampling events). |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | USGS methods were used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, may be natural condition. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>In the review of the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>A relatively low number of the water quality measurements were collected to determine whether the water quality standard was exceeded. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: San Antonio River

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | San Antonio River |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 3-5 years old. (samples taken from 2/1999 to 5/2000; 16 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 16 samples, 4 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: San Benito River

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | San Benito River |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 4-5 years old (samples taken from 12/18/1997 to 12/16/1998; over 15 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 15 samples, 0 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>None of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: San Benito River

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | San Benito River |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC-1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 4-5 years old (samples taken from 12/1997 to 12/1998; 12 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 12 samples, 5 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 2 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: San Bernardo Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | San Bernardo Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 4-9 years old (samples taken from 6/8/1993 to 5/4/1998; over 190 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 355 samples, 15 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 2 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list for dissolved oxygen because applicable water quality standard is not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: San Bernardo Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard for dissolved oxygen. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is high.

Region 3: San Bernardo Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | San Bernardo Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 3-9 years old (samples taken from 6/1993 to 5/1999). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 198 samples, 90 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 2 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: San Lorenzo Creek

Boron

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | San Lorenzo Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Boron/Water/Agricultural Water Supply |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Boron WQO is linked to Agricultural Water Supply. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Agriculture Water Supply. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old (samples taken from 7/1999 to 2/2000). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 10 samples, 10 samples exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 station. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP). |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown; may be natural condition. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: San Lorenzo Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | San Lorenzo Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 15 bacteria samples, 9 samples exceeding (60%). WQO, Station LOK 15 samples exceeding (100%). |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Agriculture, Urban Runoff, Pasture Lands and Natural Sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>All number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: San Lorenzo River Lagoon

Sediment-Siltation

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | San Lorenzo River Lagoon |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Sediment-Siltation/Water/Aquatic life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Unknown. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Sedimentation-Siltation is linked to the aquatic life beneficial use. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | N/A |
| Water Body-specific Information | N/A |
| Data used to assess water quality | The original data appears to have been based on generic information that was not truly indicative of the conditions in the San Lorenzo River Lagoon. The City of Santa Cruz's 1989 study of the lower San Lorenzo River, which includes the Lagoon Management Plan, has established that problems within the lagoon are associated with the breaching of the sand bar that becomes established between the lagoon and Monterey Bay, and are not due to the delivery of sediment from upstream sources. |
| Spatial representation | Water Street in Santa Cruz to Monterey Bay at the Boardwalk amusement park. |
| Temporal representation | The study of the Lagoon was completed in 1989. |
| Data type | Non-numerical description of the Lagoons conditions. |
| Use of standard method | N/A |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | The report describes the problem being associated with breaching the sand bar. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | N/A |
| RWQCB Recommendation | Maintain Listing. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | After reviewing the available information provided by the RWQCB and the recommendation, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body should be removed from the section 303(d) list because there was originally no information to support listing and currently there is no information available to assess if the problem due to a pollutant (upstream sediment sources). |

Region 3: San Luis Obispo Creek below W. Marsh Street

Priority Organics

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | San Luis Obispo Creek below W. Marsh Street |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Priority Organics/Tissue/Fish Consumption |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC and TSMP |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Priority Organics and PCBs MTRLS are linked to Fish Consumption. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | CTR for MTRLS in freshwater is applicable to Fish Consumption. |
| Water Body-specific Information | <p>Change listing from Priority Organics to PCBs. The following water body information is based on PCB data.</p> <p>Data 3 - 12 years old, data collected at site (Goldfish tissue sample in 1990 and a composite sample of 20 whole fish in 1999), species present at site, one time sample event.</p> |
| Data used to assess water quality | 2 composite sample, 2 samples exceeding (PCBs). |
| Spatial representation | Two samples (A composite of 20 fish and a goldfish tissue sample). |
| Temporal representation | One time sampling event in the winter of 1990 and one in the spring of 1999. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) and TSMP methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown Sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | Change Listing from Priority Organics to PCBs. PCBs MTRLS exceedance in fish tissue. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be maintained on the list for Priority Organics until more information is collected to support the change in listing. There is insufficient data to change the listing from Priority Organics to PCBs. The PCB information submitted to change listing was based on only two fish tissue samples, one in 1992 and the other in 1999.</p> <p>The data exhibited insufficient temporal coverage. An inadequate amount of water quality measurements are available to make the determination to change the pollutant designation.</p> |

Region 3: San Luisito Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | San Luisito Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 3-9 years old (samples taken from 6/1993 to 5/1999). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 207 samples, 85 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 1 station. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Santa Barbara Channel/various sites

Total coliform, E. coli, Enterococcus, nitrite, phosphate, sulfate, tu +

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Santa Barbara Channel/various sites |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Total coliform, E. coli, Enterococcus, nitrite, phosphate, sulfate, turbidity, Dissolved Oxygen Temperature, conductivity and pH/Water/REC-1, WILD, MAR. |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Santa Barbara County Creek Watchers (no QA Procedures). |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Measurements are linked to Aquatic Life, REC 1 and MUN. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Guidelines were not provided, so there is no applicability to Beneficial Use. Insufficient data was collected. Only 4 samples were collected. In addition, QA procedures were not used. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Date age = 2 years old (collected from 2001-2002) |
| Data used to assess water quality | 250 sample events. |
| Spatial representation | Unknown. |
| Temporal representation | Unknown. |
| Data type | Numerical. |
| Use of standard method | Standard methods were not used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because data was collected in absent of QA/QC, standard methods and insufficient data.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of inadequate quality. 2. Standard methods used in sample collection is unknown. <p>An inadequate amount of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded extremely low.</p> |

Region 3: Santa Maria River Estuary

Organochlorine

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Santa Maria River Estuary |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Organochlorine/Sediment and Tissue/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | BPTCP and TSMP |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Sediment ERM-PEL guidelines are linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | ERM-PELs in sediment and tissue are applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data is 3-9 years old, data measured from site/water body, one sediment sample and a composite tissue sample of 20 stickleback fish, sediment sample collected in February 1993 and tissue sample collected in August 1999. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 1 sediment sample, 1 tissue sample exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | Based on sediment sample and a tissue sample that is a composite of 20 fish. |
| Temporal representation | Samples collected from Winter and Summer, however one sample was collected in 1993 and the other in 1999. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | BPTCP and TSMP methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List due to exceedance in ERM-PELs in sediment and tissue. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the list. Data was collected from two different media taken 6 year apart and only one sample for each media.</p> <p>An inadequate amount of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is extremely low.</p> |

Region 3: Santa Maria River

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Santa Maria River |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen are linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old (samples taken from 1/12/2000 to 2/28/2001, over 15 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 32 samples with 0 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 3 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>None of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Santa Maria River

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Santa Maria River |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 33 bacteria samples, 17 samples exceeding (52%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 3 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Pasture Lands, Urban Runoff, Agriculture, Natural Sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited adequate spatial and sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Santa Maria River

Nitrate

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Santa Maria River |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Nitrate/Water/MUN |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Nitrate WQO is linked to MUN. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to MUN. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1 year old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 23 water samples, 23 samples exceeding (100%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 2-3 sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Urban Runoff, Agriculture and Pasture Lands. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information including age of the data were considered. <p>All of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Selected sites in Monterey Bay

Nickel, chromium, arsenic

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Selected sites in Monterey Bay |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Nickel, Chromium, Arsenic/Sediment/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | 1998 Master Thesis by Anuraag Gill |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Metals in sediment are linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Metals concentrations in sediments can impact Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | BPTCP protocol were used (used TEL, not PEL). Therefore insufficient data quality to list. Toxicity data was not available. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Unknown. |
| Spatial representation | Unknown. |
| Temporal representation | Unknown. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Unknown. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Natural geologic sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the list due to lack of QA/QC and standard methods used in the collection and processing of samples.</p> <p>An inadequate amount of the water quality measurements exceeding the water quality standard is unknown. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is extremely low.</p> |

Region 3: Sisquoc River

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Sisquoc River |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 1-2 years old (samples taken from 1/12/2000 to 2/28/2001; over 16 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen; 20 sample with 3 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 2 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list for dissolved oxygen because applicable water quality standard is not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have been apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard for dissolved oxygen. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Soda Lake

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Soda Lake |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2 years old (samples taken from 1/11/2000 to 5/1/2000; over 6 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 7 samples with 4 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it can not be determined if applicable water quality standards are exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that the data exhibited insufficient temporal coverage.</p> |

Region 3: Tembladero River

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Tembladero River |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 2-3 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 8 bacterial samples, 5 samples exceeding (63%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Pasture Lands, Urban Runoff, Agriculture, Natural Sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Tembladero Slough

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Tembladero Slough |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen WQO is linked COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age 2-3 years old (samples taken from 3/1/1999 to 2/7/2000, over 12 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 11 samples, 1 sample exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Tequisquita Slough

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Tequisquita Slough |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC 1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC 1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 4-5 years old. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 16 bacteria samples, 10 samples exceeding (63%) WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 station. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Agriculture, Nonpoint Sources and Natural Sources. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body information considered includes age of the data. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Tequisquita Slough

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Tequisquita Slough |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 4-5 years old (samples taken from 12/18/1997 to 12/16/1998; over 15 sampling dates). |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 19 samples with 3 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 1 sampling site. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the list for dissolved oxygen because the applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standards for dissolved oxygen. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.</p> |

Region 3: Upper Salinas River/tributaries

Temperature, Nutrients, Turbidity, Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Upper Salinas River/tributaries |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Temperature, Nutrients, Turbidity, Dissolved Oxygen/Sediment/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Las Tablas Resource Conservation District (no QA/QC program provided) |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Measurements are linked to Aquatic Life. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Unknown. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Unknown. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Data indicates dissolved oxygen impairments at Atascadero Creek and upper Salinas River. However, no QA/QC was provided. RWQCB CCAMP monitoring supplements this data. |
| Spatial representation | 20 stations. 19 stations have 6 samples. Only one station has 10 samples. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Unknown. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the list due to lack of QA/QC and standard methods used in collection samples.</p> <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeding the water quality standard is unknown. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is extremely low.</p> |

Region 3: Uvas Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Uvas Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 4-5 years old (samples taken from 12/97 to 12/98). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 7 samples, 2 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 4 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it cannot be determined if applicable water quality standards are exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is low.</p> |

Region 3: Walters Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Walters Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to REC 1. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 3-9 years old (samples taken from 6/1993 to 5/1999). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 141 samples, 75 exceeding WQO. |
| Spatial representation | 1 station. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Warden Creek

Fecal Coliform

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Warden Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Fecal Coliform/Water/REC-1 |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Fecal Coliform WQO is linked to REC-1. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | WQO is applicable to Aquatic Life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data age = 3-6 years old (samples taken from 3/1996 to 4/1999). |
| Data used to assess water quality | 292 samples, 110 samples exceeding. |
| Spatial representation | 2 stations. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling events. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Morro Bay National Monitoring Program (MBNMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Warden Creek

Dissolved Oxygen

| | |
|--|--|
| Water Body | Warden Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Dissolved Oxygen/Water/COLD and WARM |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) QA/QC. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Dissolved Oxygen is linked to COLD and WARM beneficial uses. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Exceedances of Basin Plan water quality objective in place for the protection of aquatic life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Samples taken from 12/14/93 to 5/18/98 with over 168 sampling dates. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Dissolved Oxygen: 407 samples with 144 exceedances. |
| Spatial representation | 2 sampling sites. |
| Temporal representation | Monthly sampling. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) methods. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Unknown, low dissolved oxygen can be a natural phenomenon, e.g. induced by low-flow during dry seasons, or anthropogenically induced; e.g. removal of riparian vegetation and/or nutrient loading. Determination will require further analysis. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant probably contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Watsonville River

Metals (copper, zinc, lead)

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Watsonville River |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Metals (copper, zinc, lead)/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Original data of unknown quality, newly submitted data of satisfactory to high quality. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Water column data directly comparable to numeric objectives for designated beneficial use. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Numeric data directly comparable to water quality objective. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Original data from Sept. 1994; new data (submitted in 2002) from early 1996 through May 2002. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Total water column copper, lead, and zinc. Out of 30 samples collected, none exceeded the water quality standards for these metals. |
| Spatial representation | Similar spatial coverage/locations as original 1994 sampling. |
| Temporal representation | Original listing on Sept. 1994 data only, new data cover multiple months of 6 years. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Original (1994) data = unknown. New data = yes (County, Water Authority, and RWQCB collected). |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | N/A |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. <p>None of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is high.</p> |

Region 3: Watsonville Slough

Oil and Grease

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Watsonville Slough |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Oil and Grease/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Original data of unknown quality, newly submitted data of satisfactory to high quality. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Water column data directly comparable to narrative objectives for designated beneficial use; numeric indicator similar to numeric criteria used by state of Florida. |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Numeric data as indicator value for narrative objective. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Original data 5 samples from 1994 study; new data from February and May 2002. |
| Data used to assess water quality | 23 samples all non-detect for Oil & Grease using EPA lab Method and acceptable detection limits. |
| Spatial representation | 11 locations throughout slough system (10 locations used in 1994 watershed study). |
| Temporal representation | Original listing based on 4 monthly samples from Sept. – Dec. 1994; new data cover two months (February and May) of 2002. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Original (1994) data = unknown New data = RWQCB collected, Method for Oil & Grease, EPA Method 1664. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | N/A |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | None. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 4. Data are numerical. 5. Standard methods were used. 6. Other water body- or site-specific information including the effects age of the data were considered. |

Region 3: Watsonville Slough

Oil and Grease

All of the water quality measurements did not exceed the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.

Region 3: Zayante Creek Sedimentation-Siltation

| | |
|--|---|
| Water Body | Zayante Creek |
| Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use | Sedimentation-Siltation/Water/Aquatic Life |
| Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met. | Data quality assurance procedures used. Assessment made of the consistency of methods used. |
| Linkage between measurement endpoint and beneficial use or standard | Geomorphological data linked to Aquatic Life protection |
| Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained | Sedimentation can directly affect aquatic life. |
| Water Body-specific Information | Data = 2 years (1998 and 1999), Samples collected from site. |
| Data used to assess water quality | Riffle/Run embeddedness = 45% samples exceed at Site 13a and 13b, 40% samples exceed at Site 13e, 54% samples exceed at Site Z-1, 47% samples exceed at Site Z-2, 39% samples exceed at Site Z-4, 42% samples exceed at Site Z-5, 46% samples exceed at Site Z-6. For Fine Sediments in Riffles = 40% samples exceed at Site 13b, 50% samples. Data showed impacts on fish population due to sedimentation/siltation in 1998 and 1999. exceed at Site 13c, 45% samples exceed at Site 13d, 38% samples exceed at Site Z-1, 34% samples exceed at Site Z-2. For D50: 37mm (minimum for a reach) = 12mm at Site Z-1, 14mm at Site Z-2, 24mm at Site Z-5, 30mm at Site Z-7. |
| Spatial representation | Zig-Zag sample design, 10 samples |
| Temporal representation | Late spring-early summer. |
| Data type | Numerical data. |
| Use of standard method | Standard methods were used. |
| Potential Source(s) of Pollutant | Improper/illegal grading of private roads and home sites, lack of vegetation around home sites, agriculture, residential use, roads and timber. |
| Alternative Enforceable Program | |
| RWQCB Recommendation | List. |
| SWRCB Staff Recommendation | <p>After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited adequate spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. |

Region 3: Zayante Creek

Sedimentation-Siltation

6. Data are numerical.
7. Standard methods were used.
8. Other water body- information including riffle/run embeddedness and age of the data were considered.

An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate, uncertain on how to interpret riffle/run embeddedness.

Reference List for Region 3

Staff Report

California Regional Water Quality Control Board. Central Coast Region. 2001. Staff Report for the Regular Meeting of October 26, 2001. Subject: Changes to 303(d) List of Impaired Water Bodies. October 4, 2001.

Contacts

Al Haynes. San Lorenzo Valley Water District

California Department of Pesticide Regulation, 1001 I Street, P.O. Box 4015, Sacramento, CA 95812-4015

Chris Berry. City of Santa Cruz Water Department

Cindy H. Wu, Environmental Health Technician, Ocean Water Monitoring Program. Santa Barbara County Public Health Dept

Don Funk. Upper Salinas-Las Tablas Resource Conservation District/Upper Salinas Watershed Coalition

Eric Kingsley, Water Quality Specialist. Monterey Bay Aquarium

Jessica Altstatt. Santa Barbara Channel Keeper

Jill Carlson. Santa Barbara County Creek Watchers

John Hunt, Research Specialist.

Nina Gill. (Masters Thesis)

Patricia A Shiffer. United States Geological Survey

Southern California Alliance of Publicly Owned Treatment Works. 30200 Rancho Viejo Rd, Suite B, San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675

U.S. Department of the Air Force.

Regional Board Documents/Data

Al Haynes. San Lorenzo Water District

Brian Troutwein, Environmental Analyst. Environmental Defense Center

Chris Berry. City of Santa Cruz Water Department

Chris Rose. RWQCB #3

Danial Reid, Project Manager. Public Health Department, Environmental Health Services

Danial Reid, Project Manager. Santa Barbara County, Public Health Department, Environmental Health Services

David Smith. United States Environmental Protection Agency

Drew Bohan, Executive Director. Santa Barbara Channel Keeper

Heal the Ocean, September 13, 2001.

James Nelson, President Board of Directors. San Lorenzo Water District

Jodi Frediani, Executive Director. Citizens for Responsible Forest Management

Kevin Collins, Board President. Lompico Watershed Conservancy

Matt Fabry. RWQCB #3

Patricia Anderson, Associate Fishery Biologist. California Department of Fish and Game

Robert N. Tasto, Supervisor. Project Review and Water Quality Program, Marine Region, Department of Fish and Game,

Sharyn Main. South Coast Watershed Alliance

Southern California Alliance of Publicly Owned Treatment Works. 30200 Rancho Viejo Rd, Suite B, San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675

Stephen F. Mack, Water Supply Manager. City of Santa Barbara

University of Southern California. University of Southern California